

13 JAN 1982

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Presentation of Agency's Master Development Plan  
and Environmental Assessment to the National Capital  
Planning Commission

1. On 7 January 1982, the Agency's Master Development Plan and Environmental Assessment were presented to the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) for approval. The following persons were present to represent the Agency:

James McDonald, Director of Logistics	
	Chief, Building Planning Staff, OL
	Building Planning Staff, OL
	Building Planning Staff, OL

STAT  
STAT  
STAT  
STAT

2. Robert Gresham, presented the NCPC staff position and recommendations on the project and stressed the Agency's willingness throughout the planning process to work with all local regulatory and advisory groups. Mr. Gresham summarized the staff position by recommending approval of the project and requested that additional landscaping be provided along the VEPSCO transit lines. He also requested that the Agency continue to work with the Virginia Department of Highways & Transportation (VDH&T) and local community groups to resolve conflicting positions on roadway improvements.

3. Mr. McDonald spoke on behalf of the Agency and stressed the community involvement in the planning effort. He stated that despite those efforts, the Agency found itself in a dilemma in trying to resolve roadway improvements to Routes 123 and 193. Mr. McDonald suggested that VDH&T should take the lead in developing a consensus plan and an accurate cost estimate. He advised that if this was accomplished by June 1982, it would not delay the Agency's planning and funding processes.

4. Mr. A. D. Lewis, NCPC member representing the Secretary of Defense, stated that agreement on roadway improvements could be a prolonged procedure and that a project of this importance should not be held hostage for such agreement. Several other Commission members echoed Mr. Lewis' and Mr. McDonald's remarks concerning roadway improvements and spoke in favor of the project.

5. Several persons from local community groups, including the President of the McLean Citizens Association, were scheduled to speak, but all chose not to attend.

6. Official NCPC action is scheduled for 21 January 1982, and it is anticipated that the action will be affirmative.



STAT

Building Planning Staff, OL

Distribution:

Orig - OL/BPS Subject  
1 - OL/BPS Chrono  
1 - OL Reader

OL/BPS,

(11 Jan 82)

STAT

Ladies and gentleman of the Commission, I again thank you for the opportunity to speak to you on behalf of the Director of Central Intelligence.

When I spoke to you in October, I stated our goal is to achieve consolidation at Langley without sacrifice to our reputation as a good member of the local community. Having now had the opportunity to review the detailed documents submitted and to listen to the comments of those involved in the review process, we hope that it is recognized that our words have been backed by action. We have endeavored at every step to be informative, cooperative, and constructive.

However, despite our efforts to resolve all issues to everyone's satisfaction, we find ourselves at this late date caught up in an issue that transcends this particular project and that presents a continuing problem for this Commission in dealing with development of the Northern Virginia area. That issue is how to plan for future growth of transportation.

The guidelines of the Commission and the Council of Governments stress instituting traffic management strategies such as those proposed in our plan. These guidelines are based on the assumption of near zero growth in capacity of the local road system over the coming years. This assumption appears reasonable to us based upon guidance provided us by Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation representatives who have emphasized the State's inability to fund further road improvements.

For the record: Copy of this speech given at the 7 January Hearing at NCPC given to Public Affairs prior to departing for the meeting.

The dilemma for the Agency and the Commission is that both Virginia and Fairfax County responses to our plan indicate a lack of faith in and, therefore, an unwillingness to accept traffic management strategies as a principal means of accommodating growth. Therefore, the State of Virginia has put forward an alternative road improvement proposal that is consistent with the State's view of traffic management. The State proposal to position fly-overs at the entrance to the CIA compound has obvious advantages for the Agency and is acceptable to us. The unanswered question is whether these improvements are acceptable to the surrounding community. Somewhere between the Agency's proposal and the State's proposal there is certainly a solution acceptable to all parties. We see no reason why this solution cannot be found given a little more time and continued cooperation.

Since we are dealing with a set of roadways designed, installed, and maintained by the State of Virginia, we believe it is proper to look to VDHT to now take the lead in formulating the final solution to the road improvements problem. If an agreed upon design and a budgeting cost estimate for these improvements can be reached by June, this temporary impasse will have had no impact on Federal planning.

In closing, on behalf of the Agency I would again thank all of those who have participated in the development of this Master Plan. We believe the good faith and cooperation shown during the planning have resulted in a better product for the Agency. Thank you.